



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/781,411	02/18/2004	Alfredo Li Preti	60,137-245	3061

26096 7590 03/14/2008
CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C.
400 WEST MAPLE ROAD
SUITE 350
BIRMINGHAM, MI 48009

EXAMINER

LUK, EMMANUEL S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1791

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/14/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

The arguments set forth by the Applicant's have been fully considered. In regards to the arguments concerning Schluter and Nennecker, the Applicants first argue that the stated motivation of the rejection goes against the teachings of Schluter. It is noted however in Schluter that the quieting chamber can be of circular segment for the cross-sectional area (see column 2, lines 45-49). Schluter discusses that the advantage is that the flush and contiguous with the planar end face is that it can neatly sweep all of the mixture from the chamber into the mold. Hence, the combination with Nennecker, since Nennecker teaches that the piston does not have to be flat and still have the end face be flush and contiguous with the inner surface of the chamber. The argument by the Applicant concerning the preventing a right angle flow of mixture is noted, however, upon examination of the figures, the chambers are located in right angles to one another therefore, there will be right angle to the flow of the mixture from one chamber to the next. In regards to claims 26 and 27, upon closer examination of the figures and in regards to the combination of the references for the rejection of the claims, the piston 3 of Schluter is smaller than the piston 16 of the chamber, and Applicants disregard this by stating the planar end 7 of the piston. However, the combination of Schluter with Nennecker teaches this limitation.

In regards to the arguments concerning the gas injection system, Schluter already teaches such a system. In addition, regarding claim 10, the claim as read merely states a gas injection system communicates with the mold valve chamber. The latter portion of the claim stating in response to a position of the mold valve piston can be interpreted

Art Unit: 1791

to the desired position before operating the injection, and it can also be interpreted that the piston affects when the gas injection system will be able to communicate. The prior interpretation is a process limitation while the latter interpretation of the claim is taught by Schluter (which has also been stated in the final rejection).

/Yogendra N Gupta/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791